

REMARKS

Applicant has filed amended claims 21-40 to better encompass the full scope and breadth of the invention notwithstanding Applicant's belief that the claims would have been allowable as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that no claims have been narrowed within the meaning of *Festo*.

I. Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance

If, for any reason the claims of this application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP §707.07(j) in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without need for further proceedings.

II. Drawing Objection of Figure 1

Applicant has noted Examiner objection and includes a drawing sheet with textual labels to overcome said objection.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-16 and 19-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103

Rejection is overcome by canceling Claims 1-20. Though Tsuei teaches accessing a mail forwarding system to map an old email address to a new email address, there are further distinctions of assisting a sender in the event a message can not be delivered even in the event finding a new email address from an email forwarding database is unsuccessful. In Examiner Interview on August 18, 2004, Applicant showed teachings and distinctions over prior art in step 320 and step 325 (e.g., Fig. 3A and Claim 15). Such steps can clearly be seen in new Claim 30.

IV. Rejection of Claims 17-18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Tsuei in view of Uhl

Claims 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Tsuei (U.S. Patent 6,654,779) in view of Uhl (U.S. Patent 6,292,709). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Examiner proposes that it would have been obvious to incorporate the use of postal service and sender/recipient postal addresses as taught by Uhl (Figures 7, 8 and 9 and Col. 8 lines 12-42) into the invention of Tsuei in order to provide an extension of the system taught by Tsuei to facilitate and simplify the process by which mail at a postal facility gets re-routed if a recipient address is no longer valid.

Uhl shows how markings taught in Figures 7-9 can be used to provide further assistance to a

postal carrier whereas *Applicant does not teach assisting the postal carrier in any way* but rather *Applicant teaches how additional information can instead benefit the sender*. Therefore not all steps are recited between Tsuei and Uhl in Claims 17-18. Furthermore, both Tsuei and Uhl (e.g., Abstract of Uhl) discuss methods of mail forwarding whereas Applicant does not focus on mail forwarding but rather teaches how assistance can be provided to a sender after all mail forwarding techniques have been exhausted.

For instance, no where does either Tsuei or Uhl teach the last two steps of Claim 21, "said mail delivery service providing additional information with said article of mail wherein said additional information can be used to help said sender attempt to locate said recipient; and, said mail delivery service delivering said article of mail and said additional information to said sender postal address." In light of the above, it is Applicant's belief that *Examiner does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness* under 35 U.S.C. §103.

V. Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Applicant has carefully reviewed the references cited but not applied. Applicant respectfully submits that none of those references, alone or in any combination, remedy the deficiencies of the applied art, nor teach or suggest the claimed invention alone or in any combination.

VI. Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, the present application and pending claims 21-40, as amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a formal Notice of Allowance directed to claims 21-40, inclusive.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

August 21, 2004

Eric Schneider
pro se Applicant

13938A Cedar Road #258
University Heights, Ohio 44118

(216) 231-2400 - telephone